

Appln. No. 09/992,816
Amendment dated Feb. 16, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of Nov. 16, 2005
Docket No. BOC9-2001-0040 (285)

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of November 16, 2005 (Office Action). This response is filed after the 3-month shortened statutory period, and as such, a retroactive extension of time is hereby requested. The Examiner is authorized to charge the appropriate extension fee to Deposit Account 50-0951.

In paragraphs 5-13, Claims 1-6, 8 and 10-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,085,159 to Ortega, *et al.* (hereinafter "Ortega") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,122,613 to Baker (hereinafter "Baker") and further in view of U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0077830 to Suomela, *et al.* (hereinafter "Suomela"). Further, Claims 7, 9 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega in view of Baker and Suomela and "Applicant's admitted prior art".

Independent Claims 1, 8, and 12 have been amended to further emphasize certain aspects of the Applicant's invention. Claim 11 has been cancelled. The amendments, as discussed herein, are fully supported throughout the Specification. (See, e.g., p. 3, lines 2-9, and p. 7, lines 17-26.) No new subject matter has been introduced by virtue of the claim amendments.

Applicants' Invention

It may be helpful at this juncture to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention. One embodiment, typified by independent Claim 1, as amended, is a method of dynamically displaying speech recognition system information. The method includes providing a single floating window for displaying frames of speech recognition system state information to a user. Additionally, the method includes performing an empirical analysis of a plurality of user actions and inputs so as to determine a plurality of different trigger events that cause operating states of the speech recognition system to change in

Appln. No. 09/992,816
Amendment dated Feb. 16, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of Nov. 16, 2005
Docket No. BOC9-2001-0040 (285)

response thereto. (See, e.g., Specification, p. 7, lines 17-26.) The method further includes dynamically updating the single floating window in response to the different trigger events.

The updating of the single floating window causes the individual and sequential displaying of individual frames at different times. (See, e.g., Specification, p. 3, lines 2-9.) The frames variably and individually displayed in the single floating window include a frame containing a list of valid speech recognition commands for a current speech recognition system state and a frame containing a list of alternative text selections for a previously spoken word for which a speech-recognition operation has been performed. Moreover, each variably and individually displayed frame is uniquely associated with a specific trigger event.

Another embodiment of the invention is a system for providing speech recognition system information. The system includes an empirical analyzer that determines a plurality of different trigger events that cause operating states of the speech recognition system to change in response thereto based upon an empirical analysis of a plurality of system user actions and inputs. The system further includes a single graphical user interface that is configured to display all context dependent frames of selected items of speech recognition system state information. The single graphical user interface, moreover, is further configured to dynamically and individually present at different times selected ones of the plurality of context dependent frames in response to different trigger events detected in the speech recognition system. Each frame presented is uniquely associated with a specific trigger event and is individually presented separate from any other frames.

The Claims Define Over The Prior Art

As noted above, independent Claims 1, 8, and 12 were rejected as unpatentable

Appln. No. 09/992,816
Amendment dated Feb. 16, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of Nov. 16, 2005
Docket No. BOC9-2001-0040 (285)

over Ortega, in view of Baker and Suomela. Ortega is directed to a method of displaying voice commands with multiple variables in a speech application. (See, e.g., Col. 1., lines 43-53; see also Abstract.) Baker is directed to a computer system that recognizes a speech sample by processing the speech sample with at least two speech recognizers that have different performance characteristics. (See, e.g., Col. 2, lines 25-34.) Suomela is directed to a method for automatically activating speech recognition in a terminal, wherein the speech recognition is activated when the terminal is used and deactivated after an elapsed time during which the terminal is unused. (See, e.g., paragraphs 0008, at page 1; see also Abstract.)

Applicants respectfully assert, however, that none of the cited references, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests every feature of independent Claims 1, 8, and 12, as amended. For example, each of the cited references fails to teach or suggest presenting a single floating window that, by being dynamically updated in response to different trigger events, individually and sequentially displays different frames at different times according to particular speech recognition system state information, as recited in each of the amended independent claims. Indeed, two of the references -- Ortega and Baker -- teach just the opposite. The third reference, Suomela, is silent as to any feature regarding any type of visual presentment.

Ortega teaches away from the invention in as much as Ortega expressly teaches the display information frames in conjunction with one another; Ortega does not present frames separately in sequence. The distinction is made explicit in Ortega's description of the presentment of a list of commands in conjunction with a display of information:

"[I]f the user moves a mouse over one of these fields in the WCIS window (for example, distance), the system can display the information in the further window 18. This window does not disturb the list of commands but

Appln. No. 09/992,816
Amendment dated Feb. 16, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of Nov. 16, 2005
Docket No. BOC9-2001-0040 (285)

floats over the top of the list as shown in the Figure. The question posed in the upper area 30 of window 18 is answered in lower area 32, and in addition, one or more examples can be provided." (Col. 3, lines 23-30.) (emphasis supplied.)

Baker similarly teaches, contrary to Applicants' invention, the presenting of multiple windows superimposed upon one another, not separately and sequentially. The difference is clear in Baker's description of a graphical user interface (GUI) utilized for presenting visual information to a user: "the speech recognition program's GUI is superimposed on the word processor's GUI to provide the speaker with convenient access to both programs. (Col. 1, lines 59-61; see also FIG. 2 and Col. 5, line 66 – Col. 6, line 3.) (emphasis supplied.)

By contrast to the references, Applicants' invention presents different frames individually and sequentially at different times according to particular speech recognition system state information, as recited in each of the amended independent claims. In view of Suomela's silence and the explicit language of the other two references, Applicants respectfully maintain that the combination of Ortega, Baker, and Suomela teaches away from this feature.

Each of the references further fails to teach or suggest, for example, performing an empirical analysis of a plurality of user actions and inputs to determine a plurality of different trigger events that cause operating states of the speech recognition system to change in response thereto, as recited in each of the amended claims. As noted at page 3 of the Office Action, Ortega presents frame information in response to dictation commands. Baker similarly presents frame information in response to dictation commands as well as user-dictated error corrections. Neither reference, however, teaches or suggests presenting frame information in response to a plurality of past user actions or

Appln. No. 09/992,816
Amendment dated Feb. 16, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of Nov. 16, 2005
Docket No. BOC9-2001-0040 (285)

inputs. Suomela is entirely silent regarding any such feature. More fundamentally, neither reference suggests the presenting or changing of information frames in response to trigger events, wherein the different trigger events have been determined by performing an empirical analysis of a plurality of user actions and inputs, as recited in amended independent Claims 1, 8, and 12.

Accordingly, each of the cited references fails to teach or suggest every feature recited in the amended independent claims. Applicants, therefore, respectfully maintain that amended independent Claims 1, 8, and 12 define over the prior art. Applicants further respectfully submit that whereas each of the remaining claims depends from one of the amended independent claims, these claims likewise define over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 16, 2006

Richard A. Hinson

Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
Marc A. Boillot, Registration No. 56,164
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000